

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

|                           |   |                                |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| JOHN JAMES RUMFIELD,      | § |                                |
| Movant,                   | § |                                |
|                           | § |                                |
| V.                        | § | CIVIL NO. 3:18-CV-3235-B-BK    |
|                           | § | CRIMINAL NO. 3:14-CR-367-B-80) |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, | § |                                |
| Respondent.               | § |                                |

AMENDED ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND  
DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Before the Court is Movant's objection filed March 31, 2020. Movant certifies placing the objection in the prison mailbox on March 17, 2020, before the March 23, 2020 deadline to object.

By order filed March 26, 2020, the Court accepted the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the U.S. Magistrate Judge and entered Judgment denying the motion to vacate sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, not having seen Movant's objection. The Court now considers the objection.

After a de novo review of those portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which objection was made, the Court **OVERRULES** Movant's Objection. Therefore, the judgment remains undisturbed.


IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion to vacate sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is **DENIED** and the case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District

Court, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the movant has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>1</sup>

If movant files a notice of appeal, movant must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

SO ORDERED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2020.



JANE J. BOYLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings reads as follows:

**(a) Certificate of Appealability.** The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

**(b) Time to Appeal.** Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability. These rules do not extend the time to appeal the original judgment of conviction.